REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 15-17 and 22-31 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 18-20 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riaziat et al. (US 2003/138008) (hereinafter "Riaziat") in view of Spangler (US 5,547,385) (hereinafter "Spangler"), and further in view of Patrick, Jr. (US 3,767,971) (hereinafter "Patrick, Jr.").

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 18-31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riaziat in view of Spangler and further in view of Kjarsgarrd (US 3,972,356) (hereinafter "Kjarasgarrd") and Patrick, Jr.

Riaziat discusses high-speed to-can optoelectronic packages. In Riaziat, a header 804 may be formed with a ground post 808 for grounding the package. A pair of laser posts 810 and 812 may also extend through the header 804 into the interior region for connection to a laser diode 814. The laser 814 may be mounted vertically onto a silicon submount 816, which would otherwise be mounted ordinarily around the central portion of a header for surface emitting lasers. Riaziat, paragraph [0048].

Spangler teaches blind mating guides on a backwards compatible connector. In Spangler, ground contacts extend along insulating alignment posts. Prior to connecting the signal contacts along the mating face of the connector with those of a mating electrical connector on the docking work station, the ground contacts on the alignment posts engage corresponding ground contacts on the mating electrical connector. Thus, the ground contacts of both connectors become engaged electrical connector before the signal contacts become engaged. Spangler, 1:51-1:58.

Further in Spangler, in greater detail, each electrical connector 2 includes insulative posts 12 and the conductive ground contacts 10 extending along the posts 12. The ground contacts 10, together with the electrical contacts 7, extend through the housing 4 and through

the rear face 5. Electrical terminals 13 on the ground contacts 10 project from the rear face 5 of the housing 4 for connection to a circuit board. Spangler, 3:23-3:30 and Figure 2.

Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor 10 featuring a discharge end 17 in the form of a sharp pointed cone to concentrate the static electricity and to simplify the ionization of the surrounding air so that static electricity may be bled from the resistor 10 to the atmosphere. Patrick, Jr., 3:11-3:15 and Figure 1.

Kjarsgaard discusses a lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement for an electronic semiconductor package.

Claims 1-4

Claim 1 recites: "...a ground connector having an end that is acutely shaped compared to an end of the least one active connector..." In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Patrick, Jr. to supply this feature of claim 1. The Examiner further notes that Patrick, Jr. is relied on to teach the acute shape of the conductor to assist in the concentration of static electricity, not as a bleed resistor element. However, the stated objects of Patrick, Jr. include providing a static bleed resistor which avoids the limitations and disadvantages of prior art devices. They further include creating a very durable and reliable static bleed resistor, especially a static bleed resistor which can successfully resist repeated lightening strikes. Other objects of Patrick, Jr. are to provide a static bleed resistor which (1) is self-healing; (2) is resistant to atmospheric erosion and other deteriorating effects of the atmosphere; (3) contains an internal resistance network provided with an essentially non-conducting surface so that it can be used in improved lightening handling techniques; (4) is formed from a non-tracking matrix to maintain an essentially non-conducting surface when raised to temperatures where tracking materials char; and (5) contains a fibrous tow resistance element which prevents lightening penetration. Patrick, Jr., 1:17-1:35.

Prior art is interpreted not to teach an invention particularly when stated objectives of the prior art reinforced interpretation. See WMS Gaming Inc. v. International Game Tech., 184 F.3d 1339, 51 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed Cir. 1999). The objectives of Patrick, Jr. solely discuss an improved static bleed resistor. Claim 1 recites a laser diode for an optical pickup. As the objects of Patrick, Jr. do not relate remotely to improving a laser diode for an optical pickup, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the static bleed resistor featuring a discharge end in the form of a sharp pointed cone of Patrick, Jr. with the optoelectronic

package of Riaziat and the connector of Spangler. As such, the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riaziat and Spangler is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 6-10

Claim 6 recites: "...wherein an end of the protruding portion of the ground connector is acutely shaped compared to an end of the protruding portion of the at least one active connector." In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Patrick, Jr. to supply this feature of claim 6. The Examiner further notes that Patrick, Jr. is relied on to teach the acute shape of the conductor to assist in the concentration of static electricity, not as a bleed resistor element. However, the stated objects of Patrick, Jr. include providing a static bleed resistor which avoids the limitations and disadvantages of prior art devices. They further include creating a very durable and reliable static bleed resistor, especially a static bleed resistor which can successfully resist repeated lightening strikes. Other objects of Patrick, Jr. are to provide a static bleed resistor which (1) is self-healing; (2) is resistant to atmospheric erosion and other deteriorating effects of the atmosphere; (3) contains an internal resistance network provided with an essentially non-conducting surface so that it can be used in improved lightening handling techniques; (4) is formed from a non-tracking matrix to maintain an essentially non-conducting surface when raised to temperatures where tracking materials char; and (5) contains a fibrous tow resistance element which prevents lightening penetration. Patrick, Jr., 1:17-1:35.

Prior art is interpreted not to teach an invention particularly when stated objectives of the prior art reinforced interpretation. See WMS Gaming Inc. v. International Game Tech., 184 F.3d 1339, 51 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed Cir. 1999). The objectives of Patrick, Jr. solely discuss an improved static bleed resistor. Claim 6 recites a laser diode for a printed circuit board connectable to a laser diode driving device of an integrated circuit of an optical pickup. As the objects of Patrick, Jr. do not relate remotely to improving a laser diode for an optical pickup, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the static bleed resistor featuring a discharge end in the form of a sharp pointed cone of Patrick, Jr. with the optoelectronic package of Riaziat and the connectors of Spangler and Kjarsgarrd. As such, the combination of

Patrick, Jr. with Riaziat, Spangler and Kjarsgarrd is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 15-17

Claims 15-17 have been cancelled.

Claims 18-21

Caim 18 recites: "...the ground connector is at least longer than the at least one active connector and more acutely shaped than the at least one active connector." In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Patrick, Jr. to supply this feature of claim 18. The Examiner further notes that Patrick, Jr. is relied on to teach the acute shape of the conductor to assist in the concentration of static electricity, not as a bleed resistor element. However, the stated objects of Patrick, Jr. include providing a static bleed resistor which avoids the limitations and disadvantages of prior art devices. They further include creating a very durable and reliable static bleed resistor, especially a static bleed resistor which can successfully resist repeated lightening strikes. Other objects of Patrick, Jr. are to provide a static bleed resistor which (1) is self-healing; (2) is resistant to atmospheric erosion and other deteriorating effects of the atmosphere; (3) contains an internal resistance network provided with an essentially non-conducting surface so that it can be used in improved lightening handling techniques; (4) is formed from a non-tracking matrix to maintain an essentially non-conducting surface when raised to temperatures where tracking materials char; and (5) contains a fibrous tow resistance element which prevents lightening penetration. Patrick, Jr., 1:17-1:35.

Prior art is interpreted not to teach an invention particularly when stated objectives of the prior art reinforced interpretation. See WMS Gaming Inc. v. International Game Tech., 184 F.3d 1339, 51 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed Cir. 1999). The objectives of Patrick, Jr. solely discuss an improved static bleed resistor. Claim 18 recites a printed circuit board system connectable to a laser diode driving integrated circuit of an optical pickup. As the objects of Patrick, Jr. do not

relate remotely to improving a laser diode driving integrated circuit of an optical pickup, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the static bleed resistor featuring a discharge end in the form of a sharp pointed cone of Patrick, Jr. with the optoelectronic package of Riaziat, the connectors of Spangler and the lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement of Kjarsgaard. As such, the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riaziat, Spangler and Kjarsgarrd is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 22-31

Claims 22-31 have been cancelled.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept 5, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper

Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501